

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed April 22, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-8, 10-13, 15-16, 19-23, 28-30, 34 and 37-38 stand rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,400,730 ("Latif").

Claims 1, 10 and 23 have been amended to recite that a request from the first device is a "non-SCSI formatted request." The request sent according to the second protocol, however, can be reformatted according to the SCSI protocol or a protocol, such as fiber channel, that encapsulates SCSI. Latif, on the other hand, neither teaches nor suggests that the switch should reformat non-SCSI formatted commands. Instead, the portions of Latif cited by the Examiner essentially teach a system of re-encapsulation of SCSI formatted commands. More particularly, in Latif, SCSI formatted commands can be received over an IP connection (SCSI over IP or "SolP"), a SCSI interface or a fiber channel interface. Using the example of IP to Fiber Channel in Latif, the SCSI commands from a SolP device are encapsulated in fiber channel data and the fiber channel data encapsulated in IP packets for transmission to the switch. The switch of Latif extracts the fiber channel frames from the IP packets and sends the fiber channel data to the fiber channel device. See col. 7, lines 3-8. In the reverse direction, the switch can receive fiber channel data from the fiber channel device, encapsulate the data in an Ethernet packet and sent the Ethernet packet to the SolP device according to the IP protocol. See col. 8, line 15-63. Because the switch of Latif simply re-encapsulates SCSI commands according to various protocols, there is no motivation to translate non-SCSI commands from a first protocol to a request according to a second protocol. If the Examiner disagrees, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out where the received request that is not formatted according to a SCSI protocol is found in the cited reference or allow Claims 1, 10, 23.

With respect to Claims 30 and 34, Claim 30 of the present invention recites identifying a keyword in a first request, wherein the keyword indicates the format of the information in the first request" and "parsing the first request based on the keyword" and Claim 34 recites that the first device is configured to "generate a first request containing a keyword indicating an

arrangement of information in the first request” and that the switch is configured to parse the first request based on the keyword. In the present invention, as recited in Claim 30 and 34, the first request can include a keyword that indicates how information in the request is arranged. The keyword is used to determine how the request is processed. For example, the keyword “Profile A” can indicate that the request has a different format than the keyword “Profile B” and therefore should be processed differently.

The Examiner states that Latif discloses “identifying a keyword in the first request, wherein the keyword indicates the format of information in the first request (abstract, col. 5, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 1-14, lines 44-47 and col. 11, 41-52).” In the present invention, as recited in Claim 30, Applicant notes that the abstract; col. 5, lines 57-67; col. 6, lines 1-14, lines 44-47; and col. 11, lines 41-52 do not teach or suggest a keyword that indicates the format of information in a request. Col. 11, lines 41-52 reads:

When a Fiber Channel device sends data frames to a device not located in its Fiber Channel address domain, switch 235 converts the packet into an SolP compatible packet. The conversion encapsulates the FCP data frame in IP data frame as described above. Referring back to FIG. 6a, in one embodiment, the IP addresses and the SolP socket numbers are derived by using the Fiber Channel source address (S_ID) and destination address (D_ID) as “keys” into the IP/Fiber address conversion table on the name server. The Fiber Channel address fields are replaced by the SolP socket numbers when translating a Fiber Channel Data frame to a SolP data frame.

The S_ID and D_ID are fiber channel addresses commonly included in fiber channel frames. They are used to identify the source and destination for a particular frame. The switch of Latif extracts a source address and destination address from a fiber channel frame and determines corresponding SolP socket numbers from a lookup table (i.e., from the IP/Fiber Channel address conversion table on the name server). There is no teaching or suggestion the S_ID and D_ID indicate the format of other information in a request, nor is there any teaching or suggestion that the parses the request based on the S_ID or D_ID. Consequently, there is no teaching of a keyword that “indicates the format of the information in the first request” or that the request should be parsed “based on the keyword” as recited in Claim 30. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion in the portions of Latif cited by the Examiner of a device is configured to “generate a first request containing a keyword indicating an arrangement of information in the first request” or a switch is configured to “parse the first request based on the keyword,” as recited in Claim 34. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 30 and 34 is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 5 and 14 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,400,730 ("Latif") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,739 ("Skopp").

Applicant notes that in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show: that the prior art references teach or suggest all of the claim limitations; that there is some suggestion or motivation in the references (or within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art) to modify or combine the references; and that there is a reasonable expectation of success. M.P.E.P. 2142, 2143; In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The Examiner must explain with reasonable specificity at least one rejection – otherwise, the Examiner has failed procedurally to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. M.P.E.P. 2142; Ex parte Blanc, 13 U.S.P.Q.2d 1383 (Bd. Pat Application. & Inter. 1989). When the motivation to combine the teachings of the references is not immediately apparent, it is the duty of the Examiner to explain why the combination of the teachings is proper. Ex parte Skinner, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1788, 1790 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986).

Claim 3 recites "an HTTP server coupled to an HTTP client, wherein the HTTP server is configured to receive the requests formatted according to the first protocol from the first device and wherein the HTTP client is configured to forward corresponding requests formatted according to a fiber channel protocol to the second device on the storage area network." According to present invention, as recited in Claim 3, requests received by the HTTP server from a first device according to a first protocol can be sent to a second device according to a fiber channel protocol. The Examiner admits that the recitations of Claim 3 are not taught by Latif, but states that Skopp discloses a method and apparatus to determine user identity and limit access to a communication network including: "wherein an HTTP server coupled to an HTTP client, wherein the HTTP server is configured to receive the requests formatted according to the first protocol from the first device and wherein the HTTP client is configured to forward corresponding requests formatted according to a fiber channel protocol to the second device on the storage area network (abstract, col. 3, lines 52-67 and col. 6, lines 50-54).

The abstract of Skopp reads:

A method and apparatus to determine user identity and limit access to a communication network. A first message is received from a client computer in accordance with a first protocol. A first network address is determined from the first message. A second message containing an information request is also

received from the client in accordance with a second protocol, an a second network address is determined from the second message. The requesting user identity is then determined based on the first network address, the user identity information and the second network address. Based on the requesting user identity it can be decided whether to grant an information request. If access is granted, the requested information is retrieved using the communications network.

Col. 3, lines 52-57 essentially repeat the abstract. The first request and second request of the abstract are both sent from the client computer. There is no teaching or suggestion in the abstract or col. 3, lines 52-57 that either request should be reformatted into a different protocol (e.g., fiber channel, for example).

Col. 6, lines 50-54 reads:

Thus, according to one embodiment of the present invention, an out of band protocol (PCP) is used to exchange information between the client access control application 210 and PCPD 330, which operates in parallel with the access control proxy 310.

Applicant notes that the client access control application 210 referred to in this section of Skopp resides on the same client machine as the browser initiating the information request. See, Figure 1B. The PCPD receives information from the access control application to authenticate a user having a particular IP address. If the user is authenticated, the access control proxy can use the IP address with the authenticated user to associate that user with future Web page requests having the same IP address. See, col. 6, lines 55-64. The PCP is used to communicate, for example, user name and IP address information, between the client computer and the PCPD. If a user is authenticated, then the control access proxy can allow web page requests from that IP address. Thus, the access control system of Skopp receives communications in two different protocols in parallel from the same client (i.e., receives PCP communications and web page requests). There is no teaching or suggestion in the portions of Skopp cited by the Examiner, however, that web page requests received by the access control device should be formatted in a second protocol before being sent to a second device. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion that that an HTTP client should forward requests corresponding to those received by an HTTP server from a first device according to a first protocol to a second device according to another protocol (e.g., fiber channel). As Latif does not teach the recitations of Claim 3 and Skopp neither teaches nor suggests that "the HTTP

server is configured to receive the requests formatted according to the first protocol from the first device and wherein the HTTP client is configured to forward corresponding requests formatted according to a fiber channel protocol to the second device,” Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claim 3.

New Claims

Claim 39 recites that “the switch is configured to reformat the HTTP request to generate a second request according to a fiber channel protocol.” Applicant submits that there is no teaching or motivation in Latif to reformat an HTTP request as a second request according to the fiber channel protocol as Latif deals with repackaging SCSI commands. Additionally, there is no teaching or motivation in Skopp to reformat an HTTP request as a fiber channel request as Skopp does not teach or suggest reformatting web requests in a different protocol. Skopp, instead, teaches sending a web request to an access control device and a separate PCP request. Based on user information in the PCP request, the access control device can determine whether to allow the web request. There is, however, no suggestion that the web request should be reformatted according to a fiber channel protocol. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 39-41.

Conclusion

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-41. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP.

Respectfully submitted,

SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP
Attorneys for Applicant



John L. Adair
Reg. No. 48,828

Date: July 22, 2004

P.O. Box 684767
Austin, Texas 78768-4767
Ph: 512.637.9220
Fax: 512.371.9088